UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,367	02/07/2006	George J. Baley	03170005AA	9865
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON & COOK, P.C. 11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD			EXAMINER	
			BROOKS, KRISTIE LATRICE	
SUITE 340 RESTON, VA 20190			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/05/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Comments	10/567,367	BALEY ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	KRISTIE L. BROOKS	1616					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
 A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 							
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 Fe</u>	hruary 2006						
·=	· 						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
closed in accordance with the practice under £	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-57</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
·	6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	la stia a na surina sa sa t						
8) Claim(s) <u>1-57</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	ection requirement.						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	te					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:							

Art Unit: 1616

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-20, 41, 46-49, and 54-57 are drawn to a method of reducing disease in a crop infected with at least one pathogen comprising providing a herbicide resistant crop and treating the crop with glyphosate.

Group II, claim(s) 21-40 are drawn to a method for reducing disease on a wheat crop with at least one pathogen comprising providing a herbicide resistant wheat crop and treating the crop with a herbicide.

Group III, claim(s) 42-43 and 50-51 are drawn to a method of inhibiting or treating soy rust in a glyphosate resistant soybean crop, comprising the step of treating a glyphosate resistant soybean crop with glyphosate.

Group VI, claim(s) 44-45 and 52-53 are drawn to a method of inhibiting or treating strip rust in a glyphosate resistant soybean crop, comprising the step of treating a glyphosate resistant soybean crop with glyphosate

2. The inventions listed as Groups I-VI do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The technical feature linking the groups is the treatment of the infected crops with glyphosate. However, prior art reference of record, Sanogo et al., (Effects of herbicides on Fusarium solami and the development of SDS in glyphosate-tolerant soybean), 2000, already teach the treatment of *Fusarium solami* and Sudden Death Syndrome in

glyphosate tolerant soybeans with glyphosate. Therefore, there is lack of unity a posteriori because the technical feature linking the species does not define a contribution over the prior art.

3. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

(a) fungal pathogens selected from Rhizoctonia, Gaeumannomyces, Phakopsora or Puccinia. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect <u>a single</u> fungal pathogen selected from Rhizoctonia, Gaeumannomyces, Phakopsora or Puccinia, to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

4. The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Art Unit: 1616

Group I, claim(s) 1-20, 41, 46-49, and 54-57.

Group II, claim(s) 21-40.

Group III, claim(s) 42-43 and 50-51.

Group VI. claim(s) 44-45 and 52-53.

The following claim(s) are generic: none.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The technical feature linking the groups is the treatment of the infected crops with glyphosate. However, prior art reference of record, Sanogo et al., (Effects of herbicides on Fusarium solami and the development of SDS in glyphosate-tolerant soybean), 2000, already teach the treatment of *Fusarium solami* and Sudden Death Syndrome in glyphosate tolerant soybeans with glyphosate. Therefore, there is lack of unity a posteriori because the technical feature linking the species does not define a contribution over the prior art.

Telephone Election

5. A telephone call was made to Attorney Michael E. Whitman on September 29, 2009 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the

requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KRISTIE L. BROOKS whose telephone number is (571)272-9072. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-6:00pm Est..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann R. Richter can be reached on (571) 272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/567,367 Page 6

Art Unit: 1616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KΒ

/Johann R. Richter/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1616